**Assessing monthly expenditure of farmer families in rural areas**

†1755. DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI:
SHRI RAM JETHMALANI:

Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that monthly expenditure of Rupees 2770/-has been assessed with regard to farmers families in rural areas whereas their average income is Just Rs. 2115/- p.m.;

(b) if so, facts in this regard;

(c) whether it is a fact that this difference between income and expenditure is rising since last few years; and

(d) if so, the details with regard to such difference in the year 1990-91 and 2001-02 and 2005?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI SURYAKANTA PATIL): (a) and (b) According to NSS 59th round Survey on 'Situation Assessment Survey of Farmers' conducted in Jan—December, 2003, the average per capita expenditure on farmer household is Rs. 502.83. Taking the average household size as 5.5, the average monthly consumption expenditure of a farmer household is Rs. 2765.57 at national level. (Report No. 495 (59/ 33/4). The result of the same Survey gives the average monthly income from wages, farm business and non farm business per farmer household as Rs. 2115/per month at all-India Level (Report No. 497(59/33/5). However, this figure excludes income from rent, dividend, interest and remittances.

(c) and (d) According to the Planning Commission similar data on the average monthly consumption expenditure and monthly income of farmer households is not available for the years 1990-91 and 2001-2002 and 2005.

**Allocation for TSC**

1756. SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY:
SHRIMATI VANGA GEETHA:

Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government had increased allocation for TSC under CRSP from Rs. 400 crore to Rs. 700 crore in 2005;

(b) if so, the State-wise details thereof and the works undertaken;

(c) whether Government had also sanctioned Total Sanitation Campaign projects in 62 districts in 2005;

(d) if so, the State-wise details thereof;

(e) whether Government have provided so far toilet facilities to 50 lakh households and 31,566 schools;

(f) if so, the details thereof;

(g) whether Government had also launched "Nirmal Gram Puraskar" an incentive scheme for Panchayati Raj Institutions; and

(h) if so, the present status thereof, State-wise?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI A. NARENDRA): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. Government has increased allocation for TSC programme from Rs. 400 crore to Rs. 700 crore in 2005-06. Allocation for TSC is a demand driven programme so, no State-wise allocation of fund is made.

(c) and (d) Yes, Sir. Government has sanctioned 81 TSC projects in the current financial year 2005-06. The State-wise details is given in the Statement-I enclosed. (See below)

(e) and (f) Government has so far provided toilet facilities to 80,96,521 households and 60,587 schools in the current financial year 2005-06. State-wise break-up is given in the Statement-ll enclosed. (See below)

(g) and (h) Yes, Sir. In the current financial year, so far, Nirmal Gram Puraskar (NGP) has been sanctioned in favour of 594 Gram Panchayats and 3 Block Panchayats. State-wise number of Gram Panchayats and Block Panchayats which have been sanctioned NGP is given in the Statement-Ill enclosed.

***Statement-I***

*State-wise details of projects sanctioned during 2005-06*

| SI. | State No. | Number of Projects |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 0 10 |
| 2 | Arunachal Pradesh | |

| 1 2 | 3 |
|---|---|
| 3 Assam | 5 |
| 4 Bihar | 22 |
| 5 Chhattisgarh | 8 |
| 6 D. & N. Haveli | 0 |
| 7 Goa | 0 |
| 8 Gujarat | 0 |
| 9 Haryana | 0 |
| 10 Himachal Pradesh | 5 |
| 11 Jammu & Kashmir | 0 |
| 12 Jharkhand | 0 |
| 13 Karnataka | 9 |
| 14 Kerala | 1 |
| 15 Madhya Pradesh<br>16 Maharashtra | 0 0 |
| 17 Manipur | 0 |
| 18 Meghalaya | 1 |
| 19 Mizoram | 6 |
| 20 Nagaland | 1 |
| 21 Orissa | 0 |
| 22 Pondicherry | 0 |
| 23 Punjab | 2 |
| 24 Rajasthan | 11 |
| 25 Sikkim | 0 |
| 26 Tamilnadu | 0 |
| 27 Tripura | 0 |
| 28 Uttar Pradesh | 0 |
| 29 Uttaranchal | 0 |
| 30 West Bengal | 0 |
| TOTAL | 81 |

***Statement**-ll*

*State-wise details of physical achievement during 2005-06*

| Sl. No. | State | IHHL | School Toilets |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 891377 | 1009 |
| 2 | Arunachal Pradesh | 8328 | 1070 |
| 3 | Assam | 17788 | 84 |
| 4 | Bihar | 50638 | 3437 |
| 5 | Chhattisgarh | 23219 | 369 |
| 6 | D. & N. Haveli | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | Gujarat | 62369 | 2700 |
| 8 | Haryana | 89596 | 604 |
| 9 | Himachal Pradesh | 1983 | 11 |
| 10 | Jammu & Kashmir | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Jharkhand | 49625 | 1697 |
| 12 | Karnataka | 153170 | 4411 |
| 13 | Kerala | -88219 | 259 |
| 14 | Madhya Pradesh | 349940 | 11836 |
| 15 | Maharashtra | 802113 | 9217 |
| 16 | Manipur | 672 | 72 |
| 17 | Mizoram | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | Nagaland | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | Orissa | 207884 | 1938 |
| 20 | Pondicherry | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | Punjab | 25 | 17 |
| 22 | Rajasthan | 82756 | 2761 |
| 23 | Sikkim | 7407 | 82 |
| 24 | Tamil Nadu | 2232794 | 5274 |
| 25 | Tripura | 101973 | 969 |
| 26 | Uttar Pradesh | 1963662 | 7008 |
| 27 | Uttaranchal | 45671 | 173 |
| 28 | West Bengal | 865312 | 5589 |
| | GRAND TOTAL | 8096521 | 60587 |

***Statement-Ill***

*State-wise number of awarded blocks and panchayats*

| SI. | Name of the State | No. of awarded blocks and panchayats | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Gram Panchayat | Blocks |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 10 | 0 |
| 2 | Assam | 1 | 0 |
| 3 | Bihar | 2 | 0 |
| 4 | Chhattisgarh | 13 | 0 3 |
| 5 | Gujarat | 0 6 | 0 |
| 6 | Kerala | | |
| 7 | Madhya Pradesh | 1 | 0 253 |
| 8 | Maharashtra | | 0 |
| 9 | Orissa | 8 | 0 |
| 10 | Tamil Nadu | 106 | 0 |
| 11 | Tripura | 36 | 0 40 |
| 12 | Uttar Pradesh | | 0 |
| 13 | Uttaranchal | 13 | 0 |
| 14 | West Bengal | 102 | 3 |
| | GRAND TOTAL | 594 | 3 |

**PMGSY**

1757. SHRI R.K. ANAND: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the details of the States failed to claim their share of funds from the Centre under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana;

(b) the details of the States failed to spend the amount released to them under PMGSY;

(c) the-details of the villages with population of over 1000 which have not been connected with road State-wise; and

(d) the steps to make PMGSY successful?